JUN 23 1934

Equal Rights

VOL. XX, No. 21
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY
JUNE 23, 1934

House Leaders Are Thanked for Coöperation

At the conclusion of the campaign resulting in the passage of the Equal Nationality Bill, Alice Paul, Founder, with other leaders of the Woman's Party gathered at the Capitol to thank the leaders of the House of Representatives for their constant coöperation.

In the picture, reading from left to right, are: Anne Carter, Texas; Representative Hatton W. Sumners, Texas, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee; Anita Pollitzer, South Carolina; Alice Paul, New Jersey; Representative William B. Bankhead, Alabama, Chairman of the Rules Committee; Myrtle Patterson, Alabama; Representative Clarence F. Lea, California, Chairman of the Democratic Caucus; and Gladys Estelle Magill, California, Member of the National Democratic Congressional Committee.

Equal Rights

OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Atlantic 1210
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street,
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker . . . . Editor
Emilie A. Doetsch . . . Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle . . . Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender
Zoe Beckley
Ruby A. Black
Lucia Chamberlain
Phyllis Duganne
Ernestine Evans
Rose Feld
Zona Gale
Helen Davenport Gibbons
Rebecca Hourwich
Ruth Hale
Inez Haynes Irwin
Ada Davenport Kendall
Muna Lee
Alma Lutz
Hazel MacKaye
Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ruth Pickering
Alice Rohe
Maryse Rutledge
Miriam Finn Scott
Doris Stevens
Sophie Trendwell
Brenda Ueland
Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice, Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, $2.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Chairman National Council, Sarah T. Colvin, 1175 Davern Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Vice-Chairmen,
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Gail Laughlin, Me.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Secretary, Rebekah Greathouse, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
Parliamentarian, Emma A. Fox, Mich.

Edwina Austin Avery, D. C.
Nina E. Allender, D. C.
Mrs. Dwight Clark. D. C.
Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C.
Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.
Elsie Hill, Conn.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.
Alma Lutz, N. Dak.
Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.
Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.
Mary A. Murray, N. Y.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Alice Paul, N. J.
Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N.Y.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.
Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues	$10.00
Associate Members	$1.00
Subscribing Members	$3.00
Founders	$100.00
Life Members	$1,000.00
Endowers	$5,000.00
Sustainers	$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 1]
[House Joint Resolution Number 1]

Introduced in the Senate March 10, 1933, by SENATOR JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Delaware.

Introduced in the House March 9, 1933, by REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana.

Patriotism and Its Rewards

WOMEN helped to win the World War. On the battlefield as Red Cross nurses and at home, engaged in various and dangerous war industries, including the making of gas masks and the hammering of rivets into the sheet-iron sides of battleships, they did their part as bravely as the men.

Women did a tremendous part in launching the NRA drive. Among the most active and eloquent speakers as the campaign for the New Deal got under way were women. Many clubwomen volunteered their services, appearing not only before their own club groups, but approaching men's organizations as well.

What did they get out of it?

Through Section 213 of the Economy Act, known as the Married Persons' Clause, the Government that in war times begged for their services is now summarily dismissing them.

Under the NRA, says Angus McDonald, whose article on "Sex Differentials of the NRA Codes" appears in this issue, the Administration, in spite of the "same work, equal pay" promise held out in the preliminary NRA agreement "has not pursued a consistent policy either in regard to wages, hours or night-work," and "ninety-one, or nearly one-third of the first 300 codes, provide for a higher minimum wage for men than for women."

We are accustomed to blame the Common Law for many of our troubles, but self-supporting women know to their sorrow that it is Federal law which is responsible for two of the most cruel discriminations based on sex that have ever been put into effect against workers.

We Must Follow Where They Led

WE OWE to the New York City Committee of the Woman's Party and to Mildred V. Palmer, its Executive Secretary, our thanks for sending us the text of an authentic Equal Rights document written in 1860 and signed by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and other pioneers, and publishing in vigorous language the degradation of women.

How they could write—those Titanesses of another age. Forthright, strong and sincere in their convictions, they *demanded* as Mrs. Palmer points out—their rights as human beings, denying that God approved of slavery, whether of the African race or of women, and defying "precedent, priest or Paul" to prove otherwise.

A few years after the document was written, the colored race was freed, but it took sixty years for women to win even one right demanded by the pioneers and almost automatically granted to colored men—the right to vote. And today, three-quarters of a century later, and more than a quarter of a century since Susan B. Anthony was laid to rest, there exist a thousand laws on the statute books of this country, man-made laws, denying to women the status of full citizenship.

Mrs. Palmer is right. Among our own members are many who do not realize how long women have struggled. But there are also many others outside the ranks who are not aware of their degradation or their ignorance.

It takes superb leadership to start a great movement, and certainly in this regard the Equal Rights movement, whether in 1860 or in our own day, has not been lacking. But the leaders are powerless unless they have massed behind them ever-growing and evermore insistent followers. Ignorance must be dispelled first. If the rank and file of women do not realize their subjection, how can they be expected to struggle to free themselves?

Harder than expunging a law is the obliteration of a habit or custom, especially a habit of thought and, when one realizes that the Paulian doctrine of the subservience of women has existed for almost twenty centuries, a doctrine drawn in by countless men and women with their mothers' milk, we get some idea of the magnitude of our task. Thousands and tens of thousands must be converted to our point of view, which means that we must have teachers and expounders of the truth in proportionate numbers.

There is but one answer to the question as to why, since the day this document was penned, women have advanced so slowly, and that is their failure to realize that success depends on numerical strength. From the standpoint of both justice and logic, our position is unassailable. What we need is members, organization and more organization, the close coöperation, as Kipling says, of "every bloomin' soul," before women can be recognized as human beings in their own right—not, as today, mere appendages of men or, worse still, having the dependent status of children.

Sex Differentials of the NRA Codes

By Angus McDonald

Mr. McDonald is writing his master's thesis at the University of Oklahoma on Labor Provisions of the NRA and has just completed this section. The article was sent us by his wife, Frances McDonald, who, our readers will be interested in knowing, is the sister of Muna Lee, poet and writer and former National Executive Secretary of the Woman's Party

TO attempt to analyze the provisions which concern women in the first 300 NRA codes is a rather difficult undertaking for a number of reasons. First, it is evident that the Administration has not pursued a consistent policy either in regard to wages, hours or night work. The "same work, equal pay" clause has been curiously omitted from a number of codes. This inconsistency is reflected in the multitudinous rules which have been inserted in the codes. The wages, in some cases, are as low as $0.14 per hour[1] and in others the minimum wage for males is $0.15 more per hour than it is for women. The fact that each region, each city of a certain size, each sex and each industry was considered separately has resulted in various gradations with women nearly always drawing the lower wage. Second, the pre-code condition of women's wages was relatively low. Men have always been paid higher wages in most industries. Again, women were not organized as well as men and were not prepared to exert their collective bargaining power at the time the codes were formulated. They were therefore not influential enough to obtain equality in wages.

However, women have made one advance which is significant. Of the first 300 codes, 166 contain the provision that when men and women do substantially the same work they shall receive the same rate of pay. A typical clause embodying this provision is found in Article VI of the code for the Paper Distributing Trade:

> Female employees performing substantially the same work as male employees shall receive the same rate of pay as male employees. The Code Authority shall within ninety (90) days after the effective date of this Code file with the Administrator a description of all occupations in the industry in which both men and women are employed.[2]

BUT this has not prevented discrimination in regard to wages, as will be shown. Ninety-one, or nearly one-third of the first 300 codes, provide for a higher minimum wage for men than for women. The differentials vary from $0.02½ to $0.15 per hour. Four of the codes provide a percentage differential. Article IV of Approved Code No. 285, covering the Railway Car Building Industry, and Article II of Approved Code No. 17 for the Automobile Manufacturing Industry provide that women not doing the same work as men shall receive eighty-seven and one-half per cent. of the minimum wage for males. The Automobile Manufacturing code has no provision which says that women doing the same work as men shall receive the same pay. Article IV of Code No. 110, Hardware Distillation Industry, and Article III of Code No. 153, Valve and Fittings Manufacturing Industry, include provisions for minimum wages for females which are, respectively, eighty per cent. and ninety per cent. of those of males.

THE most common sex differential puts women on a basis of $0.05 less per hour than men. There are forty-nine codes[3] or approximately one-sixth of the codes included, in this group. Approved Code No. 209 for the Musical Merchandise Manufacturing Industry is the only one providing for a sex differential of $0.03 less per hour for women. There are two industries, the Paper Distributing Trade[4] and the Wood Cased Lead Pencil Manufacturing Industry[5] which may pay women $0.03½ less per hour than men. There are five codes in the group providing for a $0.02½ difference: Approved Code No. 42, Luggage and Fancy Leather Goods Industry; No. 229, Venetian Blind Industry; No. 243, Slide Fastener Industry; No. 19, Wall Paper Manufacturing Industry; and No. 45, Saddlery Manufacturing Industry. It should be noted that codes for the two latter industries make no provision for equal pay for substantially the same work. This makes it possible for women and men to work side by side under the NRA and receive $0.02½ per hour difference in pay. There is one code, No. 172 for the Rayon and Silk Dyeing and Printing Industry, which allows women to be paid $0.10 per hour less, even though doing the same work as men. The minimum wage for men under this code is $0.45. There are three other codes in this group allowing a $0.10 per hour differential, which, however, provide that women doing the same work as men shall receive the same pay. They are: Approved Code No. 257 covering the Printing Equipment Industry and Trade; No. 234, Macaroni Industry, and No. 90, Funeral Supply Industry. Two industries are allowed to pay women $0.07½ less per hour than men: the Coffee and Floor and Wall Clay Tile Manufacturing Industries.[6] Falling in the $0.08 per hour sex differential group are: the Pottery Supplies and Backwall and Radiant, Cork, American Match, Chinaware and Porcelain Manufacturing, and Piano Manufacturing Industries.[7] Approved Code No. 93 allows the Washing and Ironing Machine Manufacturing Industry to pay women $0.06 per hour less than men. Approved Code No. 161 for the Fur Dressing and Fur Dyeing Industry provides that the minimum wage for women and males from sixteen to nineteen years of age shall be $0.35 and that for men, $0.50.[8] This is the only code which provides that females may be paid as much as $0.15 per hour less than males.

The sex wage differentials in some of the codes are not effective throughout all of the United States. In eight codes[9] the minimum wages of the men and women in the South are the same although there is a sex differential in the North. The reason for this is that the codes provide much lower wages for the Southern district than for the Northern. As a whole, women employees in the North, despite sex wage differentials in that region, receive as high wages as either men or women workers in the South.

SEVERAL codes have both regional and sex wage differentials. Approved Code No. 132 for the Malleable Iron Industry and No. 146 for the Excelsior and Excelsior Products Industry provide that Southern women shall receive within $0.02½ per hour the wage of the male workers, while Northern women may be paid $0.05 per hour less than male workers in the same district. The minimum wage for women in the South in the Excelsior and Excelsior Products Industry is $0.20 per hour while in the North it is $0.25.[10] The code limits the hours to forty, which gives the women workers in the South a weekly wage of eight dollars, if they work full time. Under Approved Code No. 167, the Set Up Paper Box Manufacturing Industry may pay women in the South $0.02½ per hour less than men while in the North women may be paid $0.05 less per hour. In the Tag Industry women may be paid $0.07 less per hour than men in the Northern region and $0.05 per hour less in the South.[11] The Southern region usually includes the States south of the Mason Dixon Line and east of the Mississippi River.

As a rule, the sex wage differential is not as great in the South as in the North. But there are exceptions, as for example in Approved Code No. 20 covering the Salt Producing Industry, which provides a minimum of $0.35 per hour for males in the North and $0.32 for women; but in the States of Texas, Louisiana, and West Virginia, designated as the South, men receive $0.30 per hour while women receive only $0.25.[12]

Two of the codes provide three zones as a basis for wage differentials. Approved Code No. 230 for the Paper Bag Manufacturing Industry and No. 120 for

the Paper and Pulp Industry require that men be paid $0.38 per hour in the Northern zone and women $0.33. In the central zone, which consists of the States of Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina and the District of Columbia, the minimum wage for men is $0.35 per hour and for women, $0.30. In the Southern zone, which includes South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, the minimum pay per hour for both sexes is $0.30, provided that on July 15, 1929, the wage was this high, but in any event it must be as much as ninety per cent. of the above rates.[13]

Only three of the codes have wage differentials on both an urban and sex basis. Approved Code No. 241 for the Chewing Gum Manufacturing Industry requires that all males in cities over 500,000 be paid at the rate of $0.40 per hour; in cities between 250,000 and 500,000, $0.38; and in cities less than 250,000, $0.37½. In each of these three groups females are to be paid $0.05 per hour less than males.[14] In the Boot and Shoe Industry[15] males in cities of over 250,000 are paid a minimum wage of $0.37½ per hour; in cities of less than 250,000 and over 20,000, $0.36¼; and in cities of less than 20,000, $0.35. In each of these three urban groups also the females are paid $0.05 per hour less than the males. All cities, regardless of population, in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma and Texas, are to be included in the last group. Men employed in the Wood Heel Industry are to receive a minimum wage of $0.37½ per hour in cities of over 250,000 and in cities of less than 250,000 an hourly wage of $0.35. Women in this industry, regardless of the size of the city, are to receive a minimum wage of $0.32½ per hour.[16]

Night work for women is prohibited in only six of the codes. In the Cloth Reel, Cement, Set Up Paper Box Manufacturing and Tag Industries[17] no female is allowed to work after 10 P. M. and before 6 A. M. The prohibition is still more strict in the Chinaware and Porcelain Manufacturing and the Paper Stationery and Tablet Manufacturing Industries[18] where no women are allowed to work between the hours of 7 P. M. and 7 A. M.

There is only one code which prohibits women from working as many hours as men. Under Approved Code No. 282 for the Restaurant Industry, men are allowed to work fifty-four hours per week while women are limited to forty-eight hours,[19] although, in cities of a certain size, hours are unrestricted for both men and women employees making a certain weekly salary. Charges for uniforms in this industry are limited to five dollars for females and five dollars for males unless the type of uniform worn is also used by other employers in the city. Then the charge is limited to twenty dollars for males.[20]

It is seen that wages under the codes afford women in many cases only a bare sustenance; that women are subject to almost every kind of discrimination. But it should also be noted that woman's position in the industrial world is appreciably better today than it was before the NRA. It is no small achievement that the principle of equal pay for the same work has been written into over half of the approved codes. It is also significant that a much larger proportion of the later codes have incorporated this provision than the first ones. While sex discrimination still exists, it is now subject to limitation. For the first time it is known definitely to what extent and in what industries such discrimination is in effect. Before the NRA there was no limit imposed.

(1) Approved Code No. 281, Code of Fair Competition for the Laundry Trade, Art. IV.
(2) Approved Code No. 176.
(3) Approved Codes Nos. 20, 21, 30, 39, 44, 65, 71, 77, 80, 81, 84, 88, 89, 100, 105, 119, 120, 132, 134, 138, 146, 148, 165, 166, 167, 170, 184, 189, 190, 193, 198, 204, 230, 236, 245, 246, 247, 248, 252, 267, 270, 274, 289, 290, 293, 294, 295, 296 and 298.
(4) Approved Code No. 176.
(5) Approved Code No. 291.
(6) Approved Codes Nos. 265 and 92 respectively.
(7) Approved Codes Nos. 284, 199, 195, 126 and 91 respectively.
(8) Art. IV.
(9) Approved Codes Nos. 21, 90, 100, 190, 204, 230, 236 and 120.
(10) Article IV.
(11) Approved Code No. 249, Art. IV.
(12) Approved Code No. 20, Art. III.
(13) See Art. V. of both codes.
(14) Art. IV.
(15) Approved Code No. 44, Art. V.
(16) Approved Code No. 270, Art. IV.
(17) Approved Codes Nos. 289, 128, 167 and 249 respectively.
(18) Approved Codes Nos. 126 and 190 respectively.
(19) Art. V.
(20) Approved Code No. 282, Art. VI.

Mary Winsor Broadcasts Feminist Platform Over WFI

ON June 7, Helen Grey, widely-known to radio audiences for her series of interviews with outstanding men and women, given under the title "Portfolio Personalities," interviewed Mary Winsor of Haverford, Pennsylvania, one of the cleverest and most eloquent spokesmen for the National Woman's Party.

Those who heard Miss Winsor's charming and witty address given at the recent Eastern Regional Conference of the Woman's Party in Atlantic City will be glad to renew their acquaintance with her through a printed version of this broadcast. It was given from Station WFI at Strawbridge & Clothier's Store in Philadelphia, and was arranged by Amy Kessler, publicity expert, under the auspices of the Philadelphia Branch of the Party, of which Sara B. Cummings is chairman. Questions and answers were as follows:

A. I am very glad to answer any questions as the representative of the National Woman's Party, a nation-wide, non-partisan organization with beautiful headquarters—Alva Belmont House in Washington—given to the Party by Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont. My audience will be welcome if they care to drop in while visiting Washington.

Q. You say, Miss Winsor, that it is a non-partisan organization? But does not membership in the National Woman's Party prevent one joining the Republican or Democratic Party?

A. No, Miss Grey, members of the Woman's Party are free to join any other Party they wish but our slogan is: "Ladies first." We are pledged to bring pressure on our respective parties in behalf of women's interests whenever necessary. For instance, when the Administration seemed to block the Dickstein bill conferring Equal Nationality on Women, a delegation of leading Democratic women went to the White House to interview President Roosevelt. The National Woman's Party has only one object—to secure for women complete equality with men.

Q. How does the National Woman's Party propose to obtain equality?

A. Through a Constitutional Amendment which is now before Congress. It is called the Lucretia Mott Amendment after that eminent Quaker Feminist, Mrs. Lucretia Mott of Philadelphia, and would establish complete Equal Rights throughout the United States.

Q. Does the National Woman's Party work only for this amendment?

A. We originate and support Equal Rights legislation in Congress and the State Legislatures.

Q. But did not women get equality when they got the vote?

A. Oh! dear no! Ancient laws discriminating against women still exist in every State. I can only give a few instances out of hundreds: Alabama, Arizona, Louisiana and Texas make the father sole guardian of the child, and in Georgia he may even will it away from the mother. Now this, Miss Grey, is contrary to the law of nature. Even the animals have sense enough to leave the young with the mother and we Feminists are trying to raise American family life to the level of the jungle.

Q. Do other legal discriminations exist?

A. There are hundreds. In Georgia, the wife's earnings belong to the husband which, of course, classifies her labor as mere slave labor. In several States the husband has the full right to his wife's personal possessions even to her jewelry and clothing. In Florida, Louisiana and Michigan, the husband can manage and

control his wife's property with the sole right to rents and profits.

Inheritance laws discriminate against women in Arkansas, New Mexico and Nevada, divorce laws are much more difficult for the wife than the husband in Texas. In more than half the States, including New York and Maryland, women have not the right to serve on juries. Women are not eligible to various State offices, as Governors, Superintendent of Public Instruction, etc., in Oklahoma. Women teachers in public schools have not the same pay for equal work as men. Women are forbidden to enter certain occupations.

Q. But, Miss Winsor, these laws to which you refer do not express the convictions of our modern men, in your opinion? Do they?

A. No. but Feminists receive sympathetic coöperation from intelligent men in their efforts to improve women's status. These laws express the sex prejudices of our ancestors.

Q. As regards these laws, what is the status of Pennsylvania?

A. Pennsylvania, thanks to the work of the National Woman's Party with the State Legislature, has comparatively few discriminations.

Q. Then you consider that progress has been made since the vote was won?

A. Yes, Miss Grey, it has. Twenty-three States have improved the position of millions of women by sweeping away many of these mediaeval laws. But hundreds still remain, and work in each of the forty-eight States to remove one law after another is slow, and so we demand this Equal Rights Amendment which would make all these unjust laws unconstitutional and prevent future discrimination against women.

Q. Has the National Woman's Party attempted any international work?

A. Yes, our latest triumph was at the Pan-American Conference at Montevideo where the Inter American Commission of Women, headed by Doris Stevens, obtained the passage of a treaty giving equal nationality rights to women. This treaty has just been ratified by the United States Senate. Formerly, if a woman married a foreigner, she lost her citizenship, thus setting up an unnatural conflict between a woman's love for her country and for her husband. No such conflict exists for an American man; he is free to marry whom he chooses—a Hottentot or an Eskimo. Now for the first time women have been made the subject of an international treaty covering practically the whole of the western hemisphere. And Congress has passed unanimously the Dickstein bill giving complete equal nationality to the American woman including the right to transmit her precious American citizenship to her children even if she is married to a foreigner and living in a foreign country.

Q. Isn't that reason, then, to be content with the present?

A. No, Miss Grey. The economic crisis is causing desperate competition for jobs; men wherever possible are sweeping their male competitors out of the way. But there is a double incentive to drive women out of all wage-earning occupations, for then they do not only cease to compete with men economically, but are in the power of men sexually, for they then would have no way to support themselves except by marriage which thus becomes a trade.

Q. Is this movement wide-spread?

A. It is world-wide. Hitler proclaims that the German woman's sole sphere is that of housekeeper and mother. Even women scientists of the highest standing have given up their positions in German universities and left their native land.

A bill has been introduced in the Belgian Parliament to drive married women out of offices and shops.

The Bulgarian Minister of Education recently dismissed all women employed in his ministry and many women teachers in the schools, and the Austrian Government discharges its married female employees.

Q. But do you consider such a movement possible in the United States?

A. It is well under way. A psychological atmosphere is being created here as well as in Europe—showing that there is undue emphasis on exaggerated femininity, keeping women busy at home with work that has little practical value and brings in no money.

Q. Do you think present-day tendencies are threatening woman's position as a wage-earner?

A. Yes, recent legislation shows this ominously—Section 213 of the National Economy Act of 1932 makes it impossible for both husband and wife to hold government positions. Women employees of thirty years standing are compelled to resign.

The National Woman's Party has defeated legislation against married women teachers in Delaware and Maryland and, under the leadership of Sara B. Cummings, in Pennsylvania. Public utilities and corporations also appear to consider marriage a crime for women although it used to be thought their highest ideal, for certain railroads and corporations have dismissed married women. As marriage today is often only made possible by the ability of both spouses to earn, this practically constitutes an *attack* on marriage. In Hungary, such a law caused seven hundred divorces in one week.

Q. But have you found that these dismissals from occupations are limited to married women?

A. No. Laws ousting all women from government positions have been proposed in California and Colorado. Senator Bratton of New Mexico said recently that in ten years no women would be employed by national, State or local governments. Would it not seem that work has been taken away from women to make more work for men — the Civilian Conservation Camps employing half a million men while no provisions has been made for women?

Q. How does the National Woman's Party feel about the NRA?

A. We are fully aware that the NRA discriminates against women in regard to minimum wages, more than one hundred temporary codes giving female employees lower wages than men in many industries. This is the first time that the United States Government has set its seal on such injustice.

Q. Has no one spoken in behalf of women?

A. Yes, Mrs. Roosevelt advocates equal wages for men and women and says that if it is necessary for the moment to ask anyone to give up wage-earning, such a request should be made of both sexes alike. But the permanent codes still contains these discriminations, and handicap women by prohibiting night work and overtime in many occupations.

Q. Then I take it you regard these trends as alarming to the welfare of women?

A. Very, but a more subtle danger comes from the so-called protective laws. Minimum wage laws for women but not for men throw women out of their jobs. Laws regulating hours for females but not for males cause wholesale dismissal of women, and prohibition of overtime and night work takes away their best paid jobs. Is it surprising that California employers dismissed women to whom they were obliged to pay $16.00 a week minimum wage and preferred men and boys at $9.00 a week?

Q. And now, Miss Winsor, resulting from your wide experience and activity for this cause, cannot you advise a helpful course of action for women today?

A. I should advise all women to stand together and to enlist the coöperation of intelligent, progressive men in behalf of this great Amendment to the Constitution which would prevent forever discrimination against women and would establish perfect equality.

Equal Rights in 1860

IN many quarters, even among our own members, the opinion prevails that the Equal Rights movement grew out of the Suffrage Movement.

The fact is, as pointed out by Mildred V. Palmer, Executive Secretary of the New York City Committee of the Woman's Party, the two movements began simultaneously or rather—as shown in an old document which, she explains, was sent to the New York Committee by a collector of antiques—the Suffrage Movement was embraced in the more comprehensive movement for Equal Rights.

Mrs. Palmer suggests that the text of the document be re-printed in EQUAL RIGHTS, "as it bears the signatures of the pioneers and furthermore is a brilliant piece of Feminist literature.

"In addition it would be well," she continues, "for those members of the Woman's Party who are quite new in the movement to have called to their attention the fact that what we are working for today was the objective of those brilliant women who first organized women for equality—that our present program is not new but this work has been going on for a very long time. And they asked for equality for *all* women and, as far back as this document was written, dared to *demand* and not request that these rights be granted them.

"Another significant fast is brought out in this leaflet. These women were not asking for piecemeal legislation, but a constitutional amendment, although it was the State constitution they wished to amend at that time. How far ahead of their time! What vision!"

The document reads:

APPEAL TO THE WOMEN OF NEW YORK

Women of New York:

Once more we appeal to you to make renewed efforts for the elevation of our sex. In our marital laws, we are now in advance of every State in the Union. Twelve years ago New York took the initiative step, and secured to married women their property, received by gift or inheritance. Our last Legislature passed a most liberal act, giving to married women their rights, to sue for damages of person or property, to their separate earnings and their children; and to the widow, the possession and control of the entire estate during the minority of the youngest child. Women of New York! You can no longer be insulted in the first days of your widowed grief by the coarse minions of the law at your fireside, coolly taking an inventory of your household goods, or robbing your children of their natural guardian.

While we rejoice in this progress made in our laws, we see also a change in the employment of women. They are coming down from the garrets and up from the cellars to occupy more profitable posts in every department of industry, literature, science and art.

In the church, too, behold the spirit of freedom at work. Within the past year, the very altar has been the scene of well-fought battles; women claiming and exercising their right to vote in church matters, in defiance of precedent, priest or Paul.

Another evidence of the importance of our cause is seen in the deep interest men of wealth are manifesting in it. Three great bequests have been given to us in the past year. Five thousand dollars from an unknown hand, a share in the munificent fund left by that nobleman of Boston, Charles F. Hovey, and four hundred thousand dollars by Mr. Vassar of Poughkeepsie, to found a college for girls, equal in all respects to Yale and Harvard.

Is it not strange that women of wealth are constantly giving large sums of money to endow professorships and colleges for boys exclusively—to churches and to the education of the ministry, and yet give no thought to their own sex—crushed in ignorance, poverty and prostitution — the hopeless victims of custom, law and Gospel, with few to offer a helping hand, while the whole world combines to aid the boy and glorify the man?

Our movement is already felt in the old world. The nobility of England, with Lord Brougham at their head, have recently formed a "Society for Promoting the Employments of Women."

All this is the result of the agitation, technically called *"Woman's Rights,"* through conventions, lectures, circulation of tracts and petitions, and by the faithful word uttered in the privacy of home. The few who stand forth to meet the world's cold gaze, its ridicule, its contumely and its scorn, are urged onward by the prayers and tears, crushed hopes and withered hearts of the sad daughters of the race. The wretched will not let them falter; and they who seem to do the work, ever and anon draw fresh courage and inspiration from the noblest women of the age, who, from behind the scene, send forth good words of cheer and heartfelt thanks.

Six years hence, the men of New York purpose to revise our State Constitution. Among other changes demanded, is the right of suffrage for women—which right will surely be granted, if through all the intervening years, every woman does her duty. Again, do we appeal to each and all—to every class and condition—to inform themselves on this question, that woman may no longer publish her degradation by declaring herself satisfied in her present position, nor her ignorance by asserting that she has "all the rights she wants."

Any person who ponders the startling fact that there are *four millions* of African slaves in this Republic, will instantly put the question to himself, "Why do these people submit to the cruel tyranny that our Government exercises over them?" The answer is apparent—"Simply because they are ignorant of their power." Should they rise *en masse*, assert and demand their rights, their freedom would be secure. It is the same with woman. Why is it, that one-half the people of this nation are held in abject dependence—civilly, politically, socially, the slaves of man? Simply because woman knows not her power. To find out her natural rights, she must travel through such labyrinths of falsehood that most minds stand appalled before the dark mysteries of life—the seeming contradictions in all laws, both human and divine. But, because woman cannot solve the whole problem of life to her satisfaction, because she cannot prove to a demonstration the rottenness and falsehood of our present customs, shall she, without protest, supinely endure evils she cannot at once redress? The silkworm in its many wrappings knows not it yet shall fly. The woman in her ignorance, her drapery and her chains, knows not that in advancing civilization, she, too, must soon be free, to counsel with her conscience and her God.

The religion of our day teaches that in the most sacred relations of the race, the woman must ever be subject to the man; that in the husband centres all power and learning; that the difference in position between husband and wife, is as vast as that between Christ and the church; and woman struggles to hold the noble impulse of her nature in abeyance to opinions uttered by a Jewish teacher, which, alas, the mass believe to be the will of God.

Woman turns from what she is taught to believe are God's laws to the laws of man; and in his written codes she finds herself still a slave. No girl of fifteen could read the laws concerning woman, made, executed and defended by those who are bound to her by every tie of affection, without a burst of righteous indignation. Few have ever read or heard of the barbarous laws that govern the mothers of this *Christian Republic*—and fewer still care, until misfortune brings them into the iron grip of the law. It is the imperative duty of educated women to study the Constitution and statutes under which they live, that when they shall have a voice in the government, they may bring wisdom and not folly into its councils.

We now demand the ballot, trial by a jury of our peers, and an equal right to the joint earnings of the marriage co-partnership. And, until the Constitution be so changed as to give us a voice in the Government, we demand that man shall make all his laws on Property, Marriage, and Divorce, to bear equally on man and woman.

New York State
Woman's Rights
Committee.

E. CADY STANTON,
President,
LYDIA MOTT,
Secty. and Treas.
ERNESTINE L. ROSE,
MARTHA C. WRIGHT,
SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

November, 1860.

N. B.—Below is the form of Petition for this year. Let every friend commence to get signatures to it without delay, and send up to Albany early in January, either to your representative or to Lydia Mott.

Orders for Petitions and Tracts, also all letters and contributions to the cause, should be addressed to our Secretary and Treasurer, Lydia Mott, Albany, N. Y.

How can any wife or mother, who today rejoices in her legal right to the earnings of her hands, and the children of her love, withhold the small pittance of a few hours or days in getting signatures to the petition, or a few shillings or dollars to carry the work still onward and upward, to perfect equality and justice?

A New York State Woman's Rights Convention will be held at Albany, the first week in February. Let there be a large attendance from all parts of the State.

PETITION

To the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York:

We, the undersigned, citizens of....., New York, respectfully ask that the word "Male" shall be stricken from our State Constitution, that henceforth our Representatives may legislate for humanity, and not for privileged classes.

The Woman at Common Law and the Woman Today

ONE of the most stimulating speeches made at the recent Regional Conference of the Woman's Party in Atlantic City was that of Josephine Biondo Lippi, a young woman lawyer of Philadelphia. Miss Lippi spoke first of the subjection of women under the Common Law whose principles are still deeply ingrained in our jurisprudence and added to this a piquant account of her own recent experiences as a law student.

She said in part:

"It would, no doubt, amuse most of you were I to tell you that I was the Wells College cheer-leader of the Class of '29, and to think that from that carefree role of song-leader I should venture with a discourse on the woman at Common Law and the woman today! Undoubtedly, you all know that the legal profession is not over-run with women. The reason, I believe, is that women are not half as big talkers as the men. My sojourn at the law school has fully convinced me that that statement is true.

"Strange as it may seem, there are a few superannuated specimens of the male sex that are obsessed with the idea that women are not fitted, either physically or mentally, to study law or any other profession. Men of high intelligence otherwise, and great learning and ability, will soon be convinced that their stuffy old ideas in that respect are rapidly on the wane. In one of the law schools in this allegedly broad-minded United States there is a dean, who, because of hidebound tradition, feels that women, just because they are women, have no place in the law. This psychology may possibly of ancient vintage, we cherish the hope that we will be welcomed into the field of the law. This phychology may possibly be due to the methods in our democratic schools today which tend to put the sexes on a par.

"To step into a law school on a pleasant day is stimulating and its brisk masculinity seems like meeting life on honest terms. It is easy to understand why some girls are fascinated by the idea of law. I for one can say that, although some of the older faculty men saw no reason why young girls should cudgel their brains over law, the majority of the younger men, like good sports, welcomed the competition. It was the younger lawyers who helped my colleague, Sylvia Detweiler, and me to enter the *one hundred per cent manly law academy,* and for the first time in 151 years two women were admitted to membership.

"But in a larger sense my own work is microscopic as compared with the splendid advance made by women within the last sixty years. Looking over the past, the time is not beyond the era of written record, when woman was a mere chattel. Legally the day is not so distant when she was not even the equal of a person of unsound mind, because a woman not long ago could not enter into or be a party to even the simplest contract. The returns of her labor gleaned in the field or the hard-earned pennies, miserably parcelled out to her in the factory, were the husband's, to have and to hold, and still are in some States in the Union. Her possessions, her whole majestic array of wedding gifts, her money, her furniture—all became the property of her husband on marriage. Her very existence, her life itself, became legally dissolved and merged with that of her husband to whom she was committed to honor and obey, whether he be knave or knight.

"In the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania it was not much more than 75 years ago that a learned Justice of the Supreme Court said in his vigorous, terse and effective manner, that it was only a sickly sentiment which took issue with the doctrine that a husband may chastise his wife with a stick, provided it was no thicker than his thumb. But times have changed and, while a woman today may make her own contracts in the law, yet she is not free. She cannot, if she is married, go bail for anybody and certainly not in Pennsylvania; and so, whether she have as much wealth as the fabled Midas or whether she be as secure as the ancient Croesus—if her husband or her sister, brother or anyone else should be arrested for reckless driving or for any other offense, a married woman cannot go bail to deliver her dear one from the jaws of jail. Neither can she make a note or endorse a note for somebody else's accommodation; and while I point these things out, I am not to be understood as agitating for any change in this part of the law because the conscious though mistaken purpose is to protect the married woman. Another thing a married woman cannot do without the joinder of her husband is to mortgage her property, even if she owns it herself and even if she has purchased it with her own money, the meagre returns of a life-long struggle. But, on the other hand, a husband can himself, without the joinder of his wife, mortgage his property to the very limit and even where the two own a property jointly, it is possible for the husband to withhold the payment of mortgage interest or taxes and on public sale buy the property in at the sheriff's sale in his own right.

"But why continue? The law is a branch of science that does not attract enough women. At a superficial glance, it does not seem to have the color or rapidity of change so much a part of woman's emotional background. It seems dull and prosy, but really it pulsates with life. The law is a field in which the emotional satisfactions of comradeship and also of conflict may be found. A call to the service of the needs of humanity may also be answered through the profession of the law. Someone has said that, if a man sees the motion of an animal in the woods, he says 'Come let's kill it.' A woman will say 'There is life, let us find it and cherish it.' I have indicated many lines along which injustice is still to be remedied. A potent illustration of this exists in a recent decision from one of our State Supreme Courts, not over twelve months ago, which held that a married man may in all good law actually impoverish his wife and strip her of her life-long hopes of gaining any portion of his property if he should die first by a devise of a *deed in trust.* Whether the wife's earnings contributed toward that property makes no difference at all and where, as in the old days of the Common Law, a married woman had an interest in her husband's property which was called a *dower,* by statute in some of our States this has been abolished, leaving her without any interest at all.

"To continue would be to strain the patience of all of you. Or it might appear that I wish to deliver an invective against men. But the fact cannot be gainsaid that it is the laws of men that have brought this nation to the precipitous brink of economic ruin and multitudes, thousands of women, have been forced to see their children go half-clothed, weakened, hungry, crying for bread and destitute in the last soul-rending years. Hopes have been blasted, education lost, fami-

lies scattered and ruined, and homes forever lost under the strident crash of the sheriff's hammer and all this dismal recital is the consequence.

"The statement bears no challenge of man-made laws. Would it be possible for women to do worse? A bountiful Creator has given you by nature the powers adequate to leadership. The opportunities to exercise these powers depend upon yourselves. I know this audience proves by the very fact of its being here that the importance of and for some years to come the history of women's progress depends on your *active interest*. Can't we all make a supreme effort to demand a greater popular membership in this organization for example and also a larger share of the responsibility now asserted by men in the conduct of our nation's affairs? The torch is handed to us. Can we carry on?

Press Comment

Doris Stevens Speaks

Atlantic City Evening Union, June 7, 1934.

DORIS STEVENS, the first woman in the world to have negotiated a treaty, will be the speaker Saturday night at the "victory dinner" of the Middle Atlantic Conference of the National Woman's Party at the Madison Hotel.

This international Feminist in December succeeded in having 21 American States, including this country, enter into an equal nationality compact, pledging the signatories to remove all discriminations in nationality against women. The compact was entered into at the Seventh Pan American Conference at Montevideo, Uruguay.

Subsequently, also through Miss Stevens' brilliant efforts in the field of diplomacy, the treaty was unanimously ratified, May 24, by the United States Senate, and was then declared by the Pan American Union as open to adherence to all the nations of the world.

So far as the United States is concerned, the treaty removes the disqualification of American mothers to transmit nationality to their children. Every other inequality in the nationality laws had been removed by the Cable Act, which Congress passed in 1922.

Miss Stevens, in addition to being a leader in the National Woman's Party, is chairman of the Inter American Commission of Women, created under the auspices of the Pan American Union and with headquarters in the Pan American Union Building in Washington.

Arabel W. Clark of Philadelphia, chairman of the Conference Committee, will introduce Edith Houghton Hooker, editor of EQUAL RIGHTS, organ of the Party and vice-chairman of the Maryland Branch, who will preside. Other speakers at the two-day sessions will be Gail Laughlin, lawyer and member of the Maine Legislature; Sara B. Cummings, educator, of Philadelphia, chairman of the Pennsylvania Branch; Mrs. Robert Fletcher Hudson of Richmond, chairman of the Virginia Branch; Amelia Himes Walker of Baltimore, chairman of the Maryland Branch; Elizabeth S. Baker of Harrisburg, one of the leaders in the Harrisburg Branch; Helen Elizabeth Brown, lawyer, and Mildred Kahler Geare, newspaper woman of Baltimore; Margaret Konig Mayhew, candidate for Congress from Maryland; Betty McGing, Goucher College senior and president of the National Student Council of the Party, and Mildred Katz, chairman of the Goucher College Student Council.

Men, as well as women, are invited to the two-day sessions. The slogan of the Party is equality of sex and its main objective the passage of an Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

The headquarters of the Party is in Washington and its founder and leader, who drafted the Equal Rights Amendment, is Alice Paul.

Atlantic City Attracts Famous Feminists

Atlantic City Press, June 7, 1934.

AMERICA'S most famous Feminist organization, the National Woman's Party, will hold a two-day conclave here on Saturday and Sunday. Although the arrangements are in the hands of the Middle Atlantic Regional Conference Committee of the organization, of which Arabel W. Clark, educator of Philadelphia, is chairman, members of the Party from other States have been invited. It is hoped in this way to make Atlantic City a yearly conference centre for the Party, attracting members from far and wide, and also to make the sessions attractive to the residents and visitors.

The sessions are open to everybody. In addition to those given over to discussions of Party problems, there will be a "Victory Dinner" Saturday at 6.30 P. M. in the Madison Hotel, where all the sessions will be held. The dinner will celebrate the recent triumph of the Party in securing the adoption and ratification of the Equal Nationality Treaty.

Back to Slavery

The New York Post, May 5, 1934.

GERMANY revives an old remedy for unemployment—slavery.

In the Middle Ages millions of men who could not pay their debts or obtain land or jobs were forced to sell themselves into bondage. They got food and protection in return for their freedom.

The gradual breaking down of that system is a large chapter in the history of human progress.

But this idea, so revolting to civilized men, is welcomed by the present rulers of Germany. They announce a plan to dodge Government responsibility for 600,000 girls who cannot find work.

The girls are to be sent into private homes as domestic servants. They will receive not one cent of pay. Their "employers" will be expected to give them food, shelter and medical attention.

The German Government is thus relieved of an expense, the housewives get an extra servant and the girls lose nothing but their freedom.

Which is no loss at all from the point of view of the Nazi statesmen.

Scores Unequal Pay for Teachers

The New York Times, May 8, 1934.

THE view that men should receive higher wages than women for teaching, expressed on Sunday by Dr. J. R. McGaughy, was attacked as reactionary yesterday by Dr. John K. Norton, chairman of the joint commission on the emergency in education of the National Education Association.

Dr. Norton, who is Professor of Education at Teachers' College of Columbia University, declared the view was socially unsound and "would wreck teaching service and set it back one hundred years."

"This philosophy is similar to the defeatism that assumes that man must helplessly resign himself to certain uncontrollable economic forces," he said. "Rather, we should recognize that the application of science and invention to industry and the development of the machine makes it possible for all men and women to enjoy a cultural standard of living, if we will summon the intelligence and courage to really use our resources.

"There is no sound justification for paying one person a much higher salary than another when both are performing equal work. The payment of lower wages to women would fail to take account of the fact that a substantial proportion of women teachers are supporting parents, sisters and brothers, and other dependent relatives."

DAY PRINTING COMPANY
PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS
600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.